Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant Early Literacy Project

Request for Application
Technical Assistance Webinar
July 1 & 2, 2020
9:00 am to 12:00 pm
Housekeeping

1. The meeting will start and end on time.
2. All participants are muted.
3. Using the chat function, please indicate your name and agency.
4. Please use the chat function for comments or questions.
AGENDA

• Welcome

• Part I:
  o Overview of the CLSD Grant
  o Hawaii CLSD Early Literacy Project RFA

• Part II:
  o Implementation Science
  o Hexagon Tool
Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant
Early Literacy Project

TA Webinar
Part I
Overview of the CLSD Grant

**Program type:** A discretionary grant funded by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Well Rounded Education Programs

**Purpose:** To create a comprehensive literacy programs to advance literacy skills, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing for children birth through grade 12, with an emphasis on disadvantaged children, including children living in poverty, English learners, and children with disabilities.

https://www2.ed.gov/programs/clsd/index.html
Hawai‘i CLSD Project

HIDOE was awarded $49.8 million for 5 years (Oct. 2019 to Sept. 2024).

HIDOE CLSD Grant

**Funding Distribution @ State Level**
- 5% - State level activities

**Funding Distribution @ Community Level – Competitive Process**
- 15% - Birth to kindergarten entry activities
- 40% - Kindergarten to grade 5 activities
  - 40% - Grade 6 to 12 activities

**Federal Performance Measures**
- Birth to KE: 4-year old oral language development
- K-5th grade: 5th grade reading proficiency
- Grade 6th-12th: 8th grade and 11th grade reading proficiency
Hawaiʻi CLSD Project

**Objectives:**
(1) Enhance birth through grade 12 literacy outcomes for our most disadvantaged students;
(2) Implement evidence-based literacy practices with fidelity;
(3) Ensure sub-grantees develop evidence-based literacy plans;
(4) Enhance data-driven decision-making; and
(5) Engage families in supporting their children’s literacy and language development.

**Initiatives:**
- Student/child literacy;
- Family literacy; and
- Culture-based education
Hawai‘i CLSD Project

**K-12 award recipients:**

(1) Campbell-Kapolei Complex Area
(2) Farrington-Kaiser-Kalani Complex Area
(3) Honoka‘a-Kealakehe-Kohala-Konawaena Complex Area
(4) Ka‘u-Kea‘au-Pahoa Complex Area
(5) Leilehua-Mililani-Waialua Complex Area
(6) Pearl City-Waipahu Complex Area

[http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ConnectWithUs/MediaRoom/PressReleases/Pages/Subgrants-awarded-to-HIDOE-complex-areas-to-advance-literacy-efforts-statewide.aspx](http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ConnectWithUs/MediaRoom/PressReleases/Pages/Subgrants-awarded-to-HIDOE-complex-areas-to-advance-literacy-efforts-statewide.aspx)
Hawai‘i CLSD Early Literacy Project

**Purpose:** To supplement current early literacy efforts with innovative strategies to:
(1) Advance the foundational language and literacy skills;
(2) Engage families to support their children’s development and learning.

**Targeted Population:** Children, birth through kindergarten entry age
- Most vulnerable population
  (i.e., families of low income household, English learners, children with disabilities)
- Underrepresented communities

Eligible Applicants: The CLSD Early Literacy Project application is available to public and private early care and education program and service providers, and community organizations who work with families with young children, or consortia of program and service providers.

Please note: the overall performance measure of the project is the oral language gains of 4-year-olds of the participating programs.
EL Project: Subgrant Awards

**Subgrant Awards:**
- Between 5 and 7 subgrants, depending on funding availability
- Maximum award of up to $350,000 per grant per year or $1.40 million per grant for 4 years
- Duration: 4 years from October 1, 2020 to June 30, 2024
- Continuation of funding is not competitive and subject to the availability of federal funds and meeting project and fiscal requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021</td>
<td>July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022</td>
<td>July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023</td>
<td>July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EL Project: Use of Funds

**Allowable Costs:**

- Staffing: Literacy Coordinator and Data Coordinator
- Cost of services, training
- In-state travel
- Supplies and materials*
- Equipment (purchase cost is $5,000 or more)
- 5% to 7% of total budget for program evaluation
- *Neighbor Island subgrantees:* additional in-state travels to attend quarterly TA sessions on O‘ahu
- Indirect costs*

---

**Supplement and Not Supplant**

Funding shall supplement (increase the level of services) and not supplant (take the place of) state, local, private, and other federal funds.
EL Project: Use of Funds

Non-Allowable Costs:

- Capital expenses, construction, or recurring operational expenses (i.e., utilities, rent, administrator salaries, professional dues or memberships, teaching staff certification or licensure renewals)
- Acquisition of any vehicle
- Employee hiring/recruitment expenses or advertisements
- Gift certificates, food or alcohol beverages, school apparel for staff or children
- Out-of-state travel or out of country travel
- Expenditures not “allowable, allocable, or reasonable” as defined by Uniform Administrative Requirements, 2 CFR part 200.

Please refer to RFA for the full list of non-allowable costs.
If awarded a subgrant, a subgrantee will be required to execute a UH FDP Subaward Agreement and submit all required forms prior to execution of the agreement.

Applicants should familiarize themselves with UH’s required subgrant templates and forms in order to expedite execution of the subgrantee agreement.

www.ors.hawaii.edu/index.php/apply/forms
# RFA: Scoring Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section Title</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comprehensive Needs Assessment (NEW)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Literacy Plan Components</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Practices/Interventions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alignment with State Initiatives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Coordination and Communication</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Points Available</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RFA Preference Priorities

Preference Priority Points (3 additional points each)

• Family literacy to support children’s early language and literacy development

• 2 or more of the vulnerable groups of children
  o Children in rural or remote communities
  o Children with disabilities
  o English learners
  o Children who are or were previously in foster care

• 4 early care and education settings
  (Center-based, Family child care homes, Family-child interaction learning program, and Home-visiting)
RFA Section 1: Comprehensive NA

Specifically addressing underserved or disadvantaged learners,

• Describe current quality and availability of early literacy efforts
• Identify community’s early literacy needs
• Describe key concerns or issues related to early literacy outcomes
• Include analysis of barriers and gaps in providing early literacy initiatives
• Describe transition supports and gaps
RFA Section 2: Literacy Plan

Incorporate:

• Elements of a comprehensive literacy instruction plan (Appendix B)
• Whole child education across all areas of learning and development
• All children, birth through kindergarten entry, include number and percentage of participating children, birth through KE, whose families income level is at or below 200% FPI
• Children in need of literacy intervention
• Family engagement
• Cultural literacy plans
• Implementation plan (Appendix D)
• Sustainability plan
Implementation Timeline

Stage Based Approach

Year 1
- Project teams
- Clarify needs
- Examine fit and feasibility
- Define innovation
- Plan

Exploration

Year 2
- Project teams develop
- Training
- Coaching
- Data systems

Installation

Year 3 & 4
- Teachers and Project Staff
- Roll-out innovation with support
- Collect data
- Reflect and analyze

Initial Implementation

Full Implementation
- Teachers and Project Staff
- Refine and use innovation consistently
- Collect data
- Reflect and analyze

Full Implementation: 3 to 5 years – Optimal Conditions

(Adapted from Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005)
RFA Section 3: Evidence-based

Explain:
• Selection of an evidence-based practice or intervention (Appendix E)
• Implementation of evidence-based practices activities
Evidence-based Practices & Interventions

The top 3 levels require findings of a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes based on:

1. **Strong**
   - At least 1 well-designed and well-implemented experimental study (i.e., randomized)

2. **Moderate**
   - At least 1 well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study (i.e., matched)

3. **Promising**
   - At least 1 well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias

Please refer to Appendix E and F for more information.
Identify:
• At least 2 indicators from 2030 HIDOE Promise Plan or
• At least 2 priority action items from Hawaii Early Childhood State Plan 2019-2024
The Student Success Indicators start from page 23 to page 27 in the 2030 Promise Plan.
The priority action items are listed for each of the five building blocks, from page 11.

Early Childhood State Plan 2019-2024
RFA Section 5: Coordination & Communication

Involvement of:
• Families
• Private and public early care and education providers
• Early intervention services programs
• HIDOE and Charter School elementary school administrators and teachers
• Other community-based organizations
RFA Section 6: Professional Learning

Provide:

- Ongoing, high-quality professional learning opportunities and coaching for educators, practitioners, and teachers
- Professional learning for administrators
- Monitoring and evaluation of effectiveness of the professional learning and impact on practice and learning
RFA Section 7: Personnel

Describe:
• Role, responsibilities, and qualifications for the project
• Responsibilities for program management and implementation
• Resources (i.e., staff, partners, providers, consultants, etc.) to carry out professional learning activities
RFA Section 8: Project Budget

Provide:

- Project budget worksheets
  - Table 1: Salary Staff
  - Table 2: Hourly Staff
  - Table 3: Professional Learning
  - Table 4: Instructional Programs and Materials
  - Table 5: Overall Budget
- Project budget narrative

Please note: Project budget worksheets and budget narrative do not count towards 30 pages narrative response limit.
RFA Appendices

• Appendix A: UH Subgrant Requirements
• Appendix B: Comprehensive Literacy Instruction
• Appendix C: Professional Learning
• Appendix D: Components of Literacy Implementation Plan
• Appendix E: ESSA Definition of “Evidence-Based”
• Appendix F: A Sample List of Evidence-Based Programs
• Appendix G: Implementation Stages Checklist
• Appendix H: The Hexagon: An Exploration Tool
EL Project: Reporting

**Narrative Progress Report**
- Quarterly reports of child progress in early language and literacy development and learning
- An annual report of activities and impact

**Expenditure Report**
- Summary expenditure reports accompanied by an invoice (Frequency of submission to be determined upon award)
- An annual expenditure report
EL Project: Measurable Objectives

**Federal**

- # and % of participating children with family income levels at or below 200% FPI
- # and % of participating 4-year-olds with gains in oral language skills

**State**

- Total # of participating children who are living in poverty, are English Learners, with disabilities, or are in foster care
- # and % of participating 4-year-olds who have been assessed in oral language skills

**Local**

- Projects to identify individual measurable objectives and establish performance goals
- Measurable goals must tie back to the analysis of data and factors contributing to underachievement in early literacy
EL Project: Proposed Timeline

06/01/2020: Revised Request for Application posted on P-20 website: http://www.p20hawaii.org/clsd-rfa2020
7/01/2020 & 7/02/2020: Technical Assistance Webinar

8/03/2020: Application due to P-20, postmarked and emailed no later than 4:00 p.m. HST

8/31/2020 to 9/30/2020: Award Notification & Contract Execution
10/01/2020: Project Start Date
10/01/2020 to 11/30/2020: Scheduled Individual TA
10/23/2020: Subgrant Kick-off Convening
EL Project: Submission Information

Mail an original and 2 copies of the completed application packet to:
Hawaii P-20 Partnerships for Education
2425 Campus Road, Sinclair Library #504
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Attn: CLSD Early Literacy Project

AND

Email an electronic files: a PDF of the completed application packet and an excel file of the proposed budget (no links will be accepted) to: p20admin@hawaii.edu. Title the email subject line: RFA No. 2020-CLSD-1001 Application.
Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant
Early Literacy Project

TA Webinar Part II
The AI Hub is developed and maintained by the State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center (SISEP) and the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN). Content is added and updated regularly. For more information, contact sisep@unc.edu or nirn@unc.edu.
Implementation Timeline

Stage Based Approach

Year 1
- Exploration
  - Project teams
  - Clarify needs
  - Examine fit and feasibility
  - Define innovation
  - Plan

Year 2
- Installation
  - Project teams develop
    - Training
    - Coaching
    - Data systems
  - Teachers and Project Staff
    - Roll-out innovation with support
    - Collect data
    - Reflect and analyze

Year 3 & 4
- Full Implementation
  - Teachers and Project Staff
    - Refine and use innovation consistently
    - Collect data
    - Reflect and analyze

Full Implementation: 3 to 5 years – Optimal Conditions

(Adapted from Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005)
Implementation Stages

- Exploration
- Installation
- Initial Implementation
- Full Implementation

What are the components of a stage-based approach to implementation?

Implementation Teams

Adapted from Metz, Naoom, Halle, & Bartley (2015)
What is an Implementation Team

A group of stakeholders that oversees, attends to, and is accountable for key functions of innovation selection, implementation, and improvement.

What it is NOT

- An advisory body
- A group that provides only periodic input or meets during crisis
- Technical work group
- Learning collaborative
Implementation Stages

To monitor progress and to make decisions about the ongoing planning, implementation, and outcomes of an intervention.
Plan the improvement

Decide next steps

Implement the improvement

Evaluate success of the improvement activity

What are the components of a stage-based approach to implementation?

- **Individual level:** teacher and staff capacity
- **Organizational level:** leadership, resources, and adequate technology
- **Community level:** additional partnership, additional resources

Adapted from Metz, Naoom, Halle, & Bartley (2015)
Implementation Stages

- **Identify**
  - Exploration
  - Assess need
  - Examine fit and feasibility

- **Plan**
  - Installation
  - Assure resources
  - Develop supports

- **Get Started**
  - Initial Implementation
  - Initiate practice
  - Use data to improve supports

- **Get Better**
  - Full Implementation
  - Practice is consistent
  - Positive outcomes are expected if practices used with fidelity

Adapted from Metz, Naoom, Halle, & Bartley (2015)
## Integrated Stage-based Work

Adapted from Metz, Naoom, Halle, & Bartley (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Installation</th>
<th>Initial Implementation</th>
<th>Full Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teams</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data</strong></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Form teams</td>
<td>- Develop team competencies</td>
<td>- Troubleshoot</td>
<td>- Use improvement cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop ways of work and communication</td>
<td>- Assure resources to support innovation</td>
<td>- Use data at each team meeting for improvement</td>
<td>- Develop and test enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conduct needs assessment</td>
<td>- Assess infrastructure gaps</td>
<td>- Assess usability testing data to stabilize approach</td>
<td>- Assess outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Determine fit and feasibility</td>
<td>- Institute practice-policy feedback loops</td>
<td>- Track and improve fidelity</td>
<td>- Collect data to support fidelity monitoring and improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assess readiness</td>
<td>- Assess competencies</td>
<td>- Improve infrastructure to support practice, organization, and system change</td>
<td>- Maintain skillful practice to produce efficient and effective infrastructure to support outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify needed infrastructure to support practice, organization and system change</td>
<td>- Develop needed infrastructure elements to support practice, organization, and system change</td>
<td>- Improve infrastructure to support practice, organization, and system change</td>
<td>- Maintain skillful practice to produce efficient and effective infrastructure to support outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Integrated Stage-based Work

Adapted from Metz, Naoom, Halle, & Bartley (2015)

**Teams**
- Form teams
- Develop ways of work and communication

**Data**
- Conduct needs assessment
- Determine fit and feasibility
- Assess readiness

**Infrastructure**
- Identify needed infrastructure to support practice, organization and system change

**Installation**
- Develop team competencies
- Assure resources to support innovation

**Initial Implementation**
- Assess infrastructure gaps
- Institute practice-policy feedback loops
- Assess competencies

**Full Implementation**
- Develop needed infrastructure elements to support practice, organization, and system change
## Integrated Stage-based Work

Adapted from Metz, Naoom, Halle, & Bartley (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teams</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Form teams
- Develop ways of work and communication
- Conduct needs assessment
- Determine fit and feasibility
- Assess readiness
- Identify needed infrastructure to support practice, organization and system change | 
- Develop team competencies
- Assure resources to support innovation
- Assess infrastructure gaps
- Institute practice-policy feedback loops
- Assess competencies
- Develop needed infrastructure elements to support practice, organization, and system change | 
- Troubleshoot
- Use data at each team meeting for improvement
- Assess usability testing data to stabilize approach
- Track and improve fidelity
- Improve infrastructure to support practice, organization, and system change |
Integrated Stage-based Work

Adapted from Metz, Naoom, Halle, & Bartley (2015)

**Exploration**
- Form teams
- Develop ways of work and communication

**Installation**
- Develop team competencies
- Assure resources to support innovation

**Initial Implementation**
- Troubleshoot
- Use data at each team meeting for improvement

**Full Implementation**
- Use improvement cycles
- Develop and test enhancements

**Teams**
- Conduct needs assessment
- Determine fit and feasibility
- Assess readiness

**Data**
- Identify needed infrastructure to support practice, organization, and system change

**Infrastructure**
- Develop needed infrastructure elements to support practice, organization, and system change

- Assess infrastructure gaps
- Institute practice-policy feedback loops
- Assess competencies

- Improve infrastructure to support practice, organization, and system change
- Maintain skillful practice to produce efficient and effective infrastructure to support outcomes

Adapted from Metz, Naoom, Halle, & Bartley (2015)
### Implementation Stages Checklist

**Resource**

**Implementation Stages Checklist:**

- Provides key activities occurring in each stage of implementation
- Can be used for team guidance or reflection
- Can help systems coaches and TA providers with identification of stage of implementation for various partnerships or projects

**Exploration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Complete?</th>
<th>If not, needed follow up steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form “Implementation Team” or Re-Purpose/Expand a Current Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Communication plan(s) developed to inform stakeholders of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exploration process (e.g. activities, participants, timeline, benefits,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risks), “launch dates”, activities, and convey support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze Data to determine need and prevalence of need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Targeted Areas to address Need (e.g. student, teacher, family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and identify programs, practices, interventions that match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target area and address need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and discuss “eligible” programs and practices (i.e. use the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexagon tool or a Delphi Process)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Resources – Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Strength of Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Readiness for Replication – Usability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Capacity to Implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select programs/practices for continued exploration based on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment results from above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop methods to promote exploration and assess “buy-in” for range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of impacted stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze information and results of exploration activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify structural and functional changes needed (e.g. policies,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schedules, space, time, materials, re-allocation of roles and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities, new positions needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Team makes final selection or makes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendation to appropriate level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Installation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Complete?</th>
<th>If not, needed follow up steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make structural and functional changes needed to initiate the new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program, practice, framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop selection form for “first practitioners” (e.g. administrators,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers or staff)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of “first practitioners”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Training Resources &amp; Logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of first cohort of implementers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop coaching and support plans for implementers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate “readiness” and sustainability of data systems including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidelity measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and problem-solve around the sustainability of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training, coaching, data systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish communication links to report barriers and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitators to next leadership level and/or policymakers during</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next stage (e.g. Initial Implementation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initial Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Complete?</th>
<th>If not, needed follow up steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication plan(s) used to inform stakeholders of “launch dates”,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities, and convey support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication protocols developed for identifying barriers and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adaptive challenges and problem-solving at each “level” (e.g. weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation team meetings to identify issues, create plans, review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results of past problem-solving efforts, forward issues to next “level”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership develops support plan to promote ongoing efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written coaching plan developed at relevant levels (e.g. utilizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, grade-level building)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching system in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data systems functioning for measuring and reporting fidelity and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document that reviews initial implementation challenges and facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for using innovation as intended (PIDA Cycles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions recommended for Implementation Drivers (selection, training,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coaching, data systems, leadership supports, etc.) based on review of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges and with sustainability considerations (PIDA Cycles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If appropriate, plan for next cohort of practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence-based Practices & Interventions

The top 3 levels require findings of a **statistically significant effect** on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes based on:

1. **Strong**
   - At least 1 well-designed and well-implemented experimental study (i.e., randomized)

2. **Moderate**
   - At least 1 well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study (i.e., matched)

3. **Promising**
   - At least 1 well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias

*Please refer to Appendix E and F for more information.*
The Hexagon Tool

Developed for use in implementation informed assessments

Reviewed and edited by the Racial and Ethnic Equity and Inclusion Team (REEI)

For use by organizations and communities

Adapted from Blase, K., Kiser, L. and Van Dyke, M. (2013)
PROGRAM INDICATORS

EVIDENCE

• Strength of evidence—for whom in what conditions:
  ▪ Number of studies
  ▪ Population similarities
  ▪ Diverse cultural groups
  ▪ Efficacy or Effectiveness

• Outcomes – Short-term/long-term
• Fidelity data
• Cost-effectiveness data
### Program Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – High Evidence</td>
<td>The program or practice has documented evidence of effectiveness based on at least two rigorous, external research studies, and has demonstrated sustained effects at least one year post treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Evidence</td>
<td>The program or practice has demonstrated effectiveness with one rigorous research study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Some Evidence</td>
<td>The program or practice shows some evidence of effectiveness through less rigorous research studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Minimal Evidence</td>
<td>The program or practice is guided by a well-developed theory of change or logic model, including clear inclusion and exclusion criteria for the target population, but has not demonstrated effectiveness through a research study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – No Evidence</td>
<td>The program or practice does not have a well-developed logic model or theory of change and has not demonstrated effectiveness through a research study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPPORTS

- Expert assistance
- Staffing
- Training
- Coaching & Supervision
- Racial equity impact assessment
- Data Systems
- Technology Supports (IT)
- Administration orientation
- System guidance on policies and procedures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Well Supported</td>
<td>Comprehensive resources are available from an expert (a program developer or intermediary) to support implementation, including resources for building the competency of staff (staff selection, training, coaching, fidelity) and organizational practice (data system and use support, policies and procedures, stakeholder and partner engagement.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Supported</td>
<td>Some resources are available to support implementation, such as resources to support staff competency but not organizational practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Somewhat Supported</td>
<td>Limited resources are available, such as a curriculum available for purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Minimally Supported</td>
<td>General guidance provided but no specific resources, such as a suggestion to use strengths based approaches with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Not Supported</td>
<td>Few to no resources to support implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USABILITY

- Well-defined program
- Mature sites to observe
- Several replications
- Adaptations for context
Program Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Highly Usable</td>
<td>The program or practice has operationalized principles and values, core components that are measurable and observable, and a validated fidelity assessment; modifiable components are identified to support contextualization for new settings or population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Usable</td>
<td>The program or practice has operationalized principles and values and core components that are measurable and observable but does not have a fidelity assessment; modifiable components are identified to support contextualization for new settings or populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Somewhat Usable</td>
<td>The program or practice has operationalized principles and values and core components that are measurable and observable but does not have a fidelity assessment; modifiable components are not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Minimally Usable</td>
<td>The program or practice has identified principles and values and core components; however, the principles and core components are not defined in measurable or observable terms; modifiable components are not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Not Usable</td>
<td>The program or practice does not identify principles and values or core components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 – Highly Usable: The program or practice has operationalized principles and values, core components that are measurable and observable, and a validated fidelity assessment; modifiable components are identified to support contextualization for new settings or population.

4 - Usable: The program or practice has operationalized principles and values and core components that are measurable and observable but does not have a fidelity assessment; modifiable components are identified to support contextualization for new settings or populations.

3 – Somewhat Usable: The program or practice has operationalized principles and values and core components that are measurable and observable but does not have a fidelity assessment; modifiable components are not identified.

2 – Minimally Usable: The program or practice has identified principles and values and core components; however, the principles and core components are not defined in measurable or observable terms; modifiable components are not identified.

1 – Not Usable: The program or practice does not identify principles and values or core components.
Implementation Site Indicators

NEED

- Target population identified
- Disaggregated data indicating population needs
- Parent & community perceptions of need
- Addresses service or system gaps
Implementation Site Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Strongly Meets Need</td>
<td>The program or practice has demonstrated meeting need for identified population through rigorous research (e.g., experimental design) with comparable population; disaggregated data has been analyzed to demonstrate program or practice meets need of specific subpopulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Meets Need</td>
<td>The program or practice has demonstrated meeting need for identified population through rigorous research (e.g., experimental design) with comparable population; disaggregated data has not been analyzed for specific subpopulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Somewhat Meets Need</td>
<td>The program or practice has demonstrated meeting need for identified population through less rigorous research design (e.g., quasi-experimental, pre-post) with comparable population; disaggregated data has not been analyzed for specific subpopulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Minimally Meets Need</td>
<td>The program or practice has demonstrated meeting need for identified population through practice experience; disaggregated data has not been analyzed for specific subpopulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Does Not Meet Need</td>
<td>The program or practice has demonstrated meeting need for identified population through practice experience; disaggregated data has not been analyzed for specific subpopulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Site Indicators

FIT

- Alignment with community, regional, state priorities
- Fit with family and community values, culture and history
- Impact on other interventions & initiatives
- Alignment with organizational structure
5 – Strong Fit | The program or practice fits with the priorities of the implementing site; community values, including the values of culturally and linguistically specific populations; and other existing initiatives

4 – Fit | The program or practice fits with the priorities of the implementing site and community values; however, the values of culturally and linguistically specific population have not been assessed for fit

3 – Somewhat Fit | The program or practice fits with the priorities of the implementing site, but it is unclear whether it aligns with community values and other existing initiatives

2 – Minimal Fit | The program or practice fits with some of the priorities of the implementing site, but it is unclear whether it aligns with community values and other existing initiatives

1 – No Fit | The program or practice does not fit with the priorities of the implementing site or community values
CAPACITY

- Staff meet minimum qualifications
- Able to sustain staffing, coaching, training, data systems, performance assessment, and administration
  - Financially
  - Structurally
  - Cultural responsivity capacity
- Buy-in process operationalized
  - Practitioners
  - Families
### Implementation Site Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Strong Capacity</td>
<td>Implementing sites adopting the program or practice have a qualified workforce and all of the financial supports, technology supports, and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Adequate Capacity</td>
<td>Implementing sites adopting the program or practice have a qualified workforce and most of the financial supports, technology supports, and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Some Capacity</td>
<td>Implementing sites adopting the program or practice have a qualified workforce and some of the financial supports, technology supports, and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Minimal Capacity</td>
<td>Implementing sites adopting the program or practice have a qualified workforce and only a few of the financial supports, technology supports, and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – No Capacity</td>
<td>Implementing sites adopting the program or practice do not have a qualified workforce or any of the financial supports, technology supports, and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study: Program X

**The Hexagon Tool**

**IMPLEMENTATION SITE INDICATORS**

**CAPACITY TO IMPLEMENT**
- Staff meet minimum qualifications
- Able to sustain staffing, coaching, training, data systems, performance assessment, and administration
  - Financially
  - Structurally
  - Cultural responsiveness capacity
- Buy-in process operationalized
  - Practitioners
  - Families

**FIT WITH CURRENT INITIATIVES**
- Alignment with community, regional, state priorities
- Fit with family and community values, culture and history
- Impact on other interventions & initiatives
- Alignment with organizational structure

**EVIDENCE**
- Strength of evidence—for whom in what conditions:
  - Number of studies
  - Population similarities
  - Diverse cultural groups
  - Efficacy or Effectiveness
- Outcomes – Is it worth it?
- Fidelity data
- Cost – effectiveness data

**SUPPORTS**
- Expert assistance
- Staffing
- Training
- Coaching & Supervision
- Racial equity impact assessment
- Data Systems
- Technology Supports (IT)
- Administration & System

**NEED**
- Target population identified
- Disaggregated data indicating population needs
- Parent & community perceptions of need
- Addresses service or system

**USABILITY**
- Well-defined program
- Mature sites to observe
- Several replications
- Adaptations for context

**FIT**
- Alignment with community, regional, state priorities
- Fit with family and community values, culture and history
- Impact on other interventions & initiatives
- Alignment with organizational structure
School District A

• District demographics
  o Population is 1% American Indian/Alaska Native; 1% Asian; 25% African American; 66% Hispanic; 15% White; 1% one or more races
  o 23% English Language Learners
  o Free/reduced priced meals: 76%
  o 19% students with disabilities
  o District in the Midwest; categorized as town

• Need:
  o 38-42% of children meeting benchmarks in the at the end of 3rd grade over the last 3 years
  o 12% of African American students meeting benchmarks at the end of 3rd grade over the last 3 years
  o 15% of students with disabilities meeting benchmarks at the end of 3rd grade over the last 3 years
Program X

• Marketed as a complete curriculum for teaching reading to children in grades 3 and above who did not learn to read well in the primary grades

• Structured to progress from phoneme segmentation to more challenging tasks, and seeks to improve sight word knowledge, fluency, vocabulary, oral expressive language development, and reading comprehension

• Uses a multisensory approach
Evidence

• Rated strong on Evidence for ESSA
• 9 studies reviewed and 1 eligible study fell within the WWC evidence standards (1 randomized controlled trial)
• Study included 70 3rd grade students in urban and suburban areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of effectiveness Improvement index</th>
<th>Alphabetics</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>General reading achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially positive</td>
<td>No discernible effects</td>
<td>No discernible effects</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average: +13 percentile points</td>
<td>Average: +6 percentile points</td>
<td>Average: +7 percentile points</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: +6 to +22 percentile points</td>
<td>Range: +3 to +11 percentile points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Domain</th>
<th>Effectiveness Rating</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Improvement Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alphabetics</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evidence

#### Program X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – High Evidence</td>
<td>The program or practice has documented evidence of effectiveness based on at least two rigorous, external research studies, and has demonstrated sustained effects at least one year post treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Evidence</td>
<td>The program or practice has demonstrated effectiveness with one rigorous research study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Some Evidence</td>
<td>The program or practice shows some evidence of effectiveness through less rigorous research studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Minimal Evidence</td>
<td>The program or practice is guided by a well-developed theory of change or logic model, including clear inclusion and exclusion criteria for the target population, but has not demonstrated effectiveness through a research study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – No Evidence</td>
<td>The program or practice does not have a well-developed logic model or theory of change and has not demonstrated effectiveness through a research study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supports

Program X

Publisher:
• Provides different levels of professional development and support for teachers, offering in-service professional development to school districts as well as public workshops. A two-day public professional development course costs $325

Local support:
• No local training or coaching currently available from the regional agency

Data:
• No data system included
**Supports**

- Supports available for developing organizational and systems readiness, engaging key stakeholders and decision-support data systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Well Supported</td>
<td>Comprehensive resources are available from an expert (a program developer or intermediary) to support implementation, including resources for building the competency of staff (staff selection, training, coaching, fidelity) and organizational practice (data system and use support, policies and procedures, stakeholder and partner engagement.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Supported</td>
<td>Some resources are available to support implementation, such as resources to support staff competency but not organizational practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Somewhat Supported</td>
<td>Limited resources are available, such as a curriculum available for purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Minimally Supported</td>
<td>General guidance provided but no specific resources, such as a suggestion to use strengths-based approaches with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Not Supported</td>
<td>Few to no resources to support implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program X

Operationalized Principles:
• Formulated set of beliefs and principles

Core Components:
• 10-part lesson plan emphasizing word study, spelling, fluency, and comprehension
• Can be used in reading classes, small groups, or tutorials, for 45–90 minute daily lessons in general or special education classrooms
• No fidelity assessment

Materials:
• Instructor manuals included
• No fidelity assessment
Usability

• Extent to which EBP/EIP approach is well-defined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usability Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Highly Usable</td>
<td>The program or practice has operationalized principles and values, core components that are measurable and observable, and a validated fidelity assessment; modifiable components are identified to support contextualization for new settings or populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Usable</td>
<td>The program or practice has operationalized principles and values and core components that are measurable and observable but does not have a fidelity assessment; modifiable components are identified to support contextualization for new settings or populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Somewhat Usable</td>
<td>The program or practice has operationalized principles and values and core components that are measurable and observable but does not have a fidelity assessment; modifiable components are not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Minimally Usable</td>
<td>The program or practice has identified principles and values and core components; however, the principles and core components are not defined in measurable or observable terms; modifiable components are not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Not Usable</td>
<td>The program or practice does not identify principles and values or core components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population:
- Population is 1% American Indian/Alaska Native; 1% Asian; 25% African American; 66% Hispanic; 15% White; 1% 1 or more races
- 23% English Language Learners
- Free/reduced priced meals: 76%
- 19% students with disabilities
- District in the Midwest; categorized as town

Research sample:
- 70 3rd grade students - In the intervention group, 61% of the students were female, 45% were African-American, and 36% were eligible for the free/reduced lunch program.
- Less rigorous studies show potentially positive effects, but do provide disaggregated results

Results:
- Statistically significant positive effects on WRMT–R word attack and TOWRE-PDE posttest scores only for students who were not eligible for free/reduced lunch program, but not for those students who were eligible for free/reduced lunch
- Evidence for ESSA reports groups included: African American, Free and Reduced Price Meals, White
- Reported proven effective with White students

Need
- School District A
Need

- Data demonstrating the needs of the population and the EBP/EIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Strongly Meets Need</td>
<td>The program or practice has demonstrated meeting need for identified population through rigorous research (e.g., experimental design) with comparable population; disaggregated data has been analyzed to demonstrate program or practice meets need of specific subpopulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Meets Need</td>
<td>The program or practice has demonstrated meeting need for identified population through rigorous research (e.g., experimental design) with comparable population; disaggregated data has not been analyzed for specific subpopulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Somewhat Meets Need</td>
<td>The program or practice has demonstrated meeting need for identified population through less rigorous research design (e.g., quasi-experimental, pre-post) with comparable population; disaggregated data has not been analyzed for specific subpopulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Minimally Meets Need</td>
<td>The program or practice has demonstrated meeting need for identified population through practice experience; disaggregated data has not been analyzed for specific subpopulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Does Not Meet Need</td>
<td>The program or practice has not demonstrated meeting need for identified population through practice experience; disaggregated data has not been analyzed for specific subpopulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priorities:
• Literacy identified as priority within district and school improvement
• Is a priority in the state

Values:
• Meetings haven’t included family voice in identified need and values related to literacy
• Historically teacher autonomy has been highly valued with each teacher chooses own books and materials to provide literacy support

Existing Initiatives:
• New core materials being implemented in K-5 – unsure of alignment
• District has not outlined core components of reading interventions
**Fit**

- Alignment of EBP/EIP approach with site, local, state priorities and initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Strong Fit</td>
<td>The program or practice fits with the priorities of the implementing site; community values, including the values of culturally and linguistically specific populations; and other existing initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Fit</td>
<td>The program or practice fits with the priorities of the implementing site and community values; however, the values of culturally and linguistically specific population have not been assessed for fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Somewhat Fit</td>
<td>The program or practice fits with the priorities of the implementing site, but it is unclear whether it aligns with community values and other existing initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Minimal Fit</td>
<td>The program or practice fits with some of the priorities of the implementing site, but it is unclear whether it aligns with community values and other existing initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – No Fit</td>
<td>The program or practice does not fit with the priorities of the implementing site or community values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capacity

• School District A

Workforce:
• No one on staff or in surrounding areas has utilized Program X
• Research studies – teachers received on average 70 hours of professional development
• New Instructional Coach hired by the district for the upcoming school year

Financial Supports:
• Superintendent and school board have committed to providing funding for purchase of materials and 2 days of training

Organization Supports:
• Two days prior to the start of the school year allotted for professional development
• Current data system support collection and entry of student data
**Capacity**

- Required staffing and administrative practices, and capacity for data input and analysis, and fidelity and outcome assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 – Strong Capacity</th>
<th>Implementing sites adopting the program or practice have a qualified workforce and all of the financial supports, technology supports, and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 – Adequate Capacity</td>
<td>Implementing sites adopting the program or practice have a qualified workforce and most of the financial supports, technology supports, and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Some Capacity</td>
<td>Implementing sites adopting the program or practice have a qualified workforce and some of the financial supports, technology supports, and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Minimal Capacity</td>
<td>Implementing sites adopting the program or practice have a qualified workforce and only a few of the financial supports, technology supports, and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – No Capacity</td>
<td>Implementing sites adopting the program or practice do not have a qualified workforce or any of the financial supports, technology supports, and administrative supports required to implement and sustain the program or practice with integrity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion and Recommendations

What are key take-aways?

Would the team recommend *Program X for this district*?

- If yes, what next steps are needed?
- If no, what take-aways from this discussion might inform the next selection of a program?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Realized Benefits of Engaging in "Hexagon" Process

• Encourages discussion beyond evidence – what will it take to implement this? How does this fit?
• Engages multiple voices in decision making
• Promotes buy-in and creates readiness
• Provides talking points in communication (e.g., rationales for why this practice and not another practice)
• Provides data and information to guide planning the necessary infrastructure supports (e.g., Installation Stage Activities)
The Active Implementation Hub is a free, online learning environment for use by any stakeholder — practitioners, educators, coaches, trainers, surveyors — involved in active implementation and scaling up of programs and innovations. The site goal is to increase the knowledge and improve the performance of persons engaged in actively implementing any program or practice.

While AI Modules and Lessons offer activities well-suited for many human service fields, the site currently focuses on active implementation and scaling up in the field of Education. Most e-learning content is appropriate for implementation teams, implementation specialists, administrators and technical assistance/professional development providers at any level in a system (e.g., district, region, state, national).

Online Learning Includes:

- **Modules**: Check out internet-based training on active implementation, including content, activities and assessments, designed to be self-paced or blended with in-service or in-service training.

- **Lessons & Short Courses**: AI Hub Lessons and Short Courses will get you and your team started using implementation tools and practices, so that you can build implementation skills and capacity. These resources can be used for self-paced learning or professional development in a team setting.

- **Resource Library**: Find just-in-time active implementation resources and tools (e.g., planning tools, handouts and video clips).
The mission of the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) is to contribute to the best practices and science of implementation, organization change, and system reinvention to improve outcomes across the spectrum of human services.
Evidence-based Resources

• What Works Clearinghouse
• National Center on Improving Literacy
• Head Start Early Childhood Learning & Knowledge Center Curriculum Consumer Report
• US DOE Early Learning-Proven Methods
• Best Evidence Encyclopedia
• Goodling Center for Research in Family Literacy
• National Association for the Education of Young Children
• Center for the Enhancement of Early Learning Outcomes’ summary of 20 states
Thank you for your participation!